Analytical Writing Rubric- Character Analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Thinking** | |  | | --- | | Includes a compelling thesis that demonstrates a deep understanding of the character. | | Selects key evidence (CD) from the text. | | Includes insightful commentary (CM1) that explains meaning/significance of evidence. | | Includes astute commentary (CM2) that relates evidence to thesis. | | 9 8 7 6 | 5 | 4 3 2 1 | |  | | --- | | Thesis is inaccurate or overly simplistic; misses the complexity of the character or the piece. | | Selects evidence that is not very meaningful or significant. | | Associations are overly simplistic or not fully or accurately explained. | | Notes particular text evidence (CD) but can’t explain clearly nor connect them to the thesis. | |
| **Writing** | |  | | --- | | Clearly and forcefully conveys ideas. | | Demonstrates sophisticated word choice. | | Writing is fluid with mature syntax that uses advanced constructions. | | Integrates textual evidence smoothly, seamlessly embedding quotes from the text in own writing. | | Evidences firm control of GUM. | | 9 8 7 6 | 5 | 4 3 2 1 | |  | | --- | | Struggles to explain ideas clearly; is often wordy or confusing. | | Shows a limited vocabulary; uses trash words (thing, stuff, a lot, very…) | | Uses a limited range of sentence constructions; uses few if any advanced constructions. | | Quotes long sentences and /or awkwardly plops in quotes from text. | | Struggles with GUM; has run-on’s, fragments, pronoun-antecedent agreement errors, passive voice. | |